

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/600,676	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YOUNGER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> A. Dexter Tugbang	<b>Art Unit</b> 3729

**All Participants:****Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_(1) A. Dexter Tugbang, Examiner.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Paul R. Katterle, for Applicant(s).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 25 May 2006**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

36

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

**Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner noted that the language in Claim 36 was awkwardly worded and confusing and suggested changes to correct this. The examiner suggested changes to the language such that it would agree with the specification (page 8, paragraphs [0030] and [0031]. The applicant(s) agreed to the suggested changes, which is in the attached examiner's amendment and now places the application in condition for allowance..